

EXHIBIT 3-E

SAMPLE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CONSULTANT PROPOSALS

CONSULTANT RANKING FACTORS

1. QUALITY OF THE PROPOSAL

- a. Does the proposal respond comprehensively to the tasks outlined in the request for proposals (RFP)?

Comment:

- b. Does the proposal reflect a good understanding of the technical issues involved in the project?

Comment:

- c. Does the proposal indicate an understanding of the requirements that must be complied with for a CDBG project (and the other state or federal funding sources involved)?

Comment:

- d. Has the consultant provided a clear description of how the work will be managed and how the consultant will coordinate with local officials and staff?

Comment:

- e. Has the consultant provided a step by step timetable for the work with milestones indicating when key tasks will be performed and by whom? Does the schedule appear complete and realistic?

Comment:

ENGINEERING ONLY:

- f. Did the proposal include more than one technical alternative? If so, do the alternatives appear appropriate to the community's location, size, and financial and physical constraints?

Comment:

- g. Does the recommended alternative minimize long-term operation and maintenance costs?

Comment:

SCORE FOR QUALITY OF PROPOSAL:

- ☐ BEST (200 POINTS)
- ☐ ABOVE AVERAGE (150 POINTS)
- ☐ AVERAGE (100 POINTS)
- ☐ BELOW AVERAGE (50 POINTS)
- ☐ POOR (0 POINTS)

2. CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- a. Does the consultant have experience with similar federally financed projects involving compliance with both federal and state requirements?

Comment:

- b. Does the staff to be assigned to the project on a day-to-day basis have technical training and experience appropriate to the scope of work in the RFP?

Comment:

- c. To what extent will experienced senior staff be available to supervise project staff on-site?

Comment:

- d. If the consultant has done work previously for the community, how did they perform?

Comment:

- e. How do previous clients rate the consultant's performance? What is the consultant's track record on similar projects for timely performance within original budgets?

Comment:

- f. Are the reference checks supportive of the consultant's technical abilities and ability to work cooperatively with local officials?

Comment:

SCORE FOR CONSULTANT EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS:

- _____ BEST (200 POINTS)
- _____ ABOVE AVERAGE (150 POINTS)
- _____ AVERAGE (100 POINTS)
- _____ BELOW AVERAGE (50 POINTS)
- _____ POOR (0 POINTS)

3. AVAILABILITY AND CAPACITY OF THE CONSULTANT

- a. What is the current and projected workload of the consultant and how much time will the consultant have available to devote to the project?

Comment:

- b. Where is the firm located?

Comment:

- c. How much time will the consultant or staff actually spend in the community on a day-to-day basis over the term of the project?

Comment:

- d. Is the consultant capable of meeting the time and budget requirements for the project?

Comment:

SCORE FOR AVAILABILITY AND CAPACITY OF THE CONSULTANT:

- _____ BEST (100 POINTS)
- _____ ABOVE AVERAGE (75 POINTS)
- _____ AVERAGE (50 POINTS)
- _____ BELOW AVERAGE (25 POINTS)
- _____ POOR (0 POINTS)

Note: The above factors and questions under them are examples which are designed to fulfill federal requirements, as well as Montana's law regarding procurement of engineering, architectural, or surveying services. You may want to adapt your RFP, including your evaluation factors and system for awarding points, to the key issues involved in your project and the type of assistance you are seeking. If you modify the sample factors or questions, please keep in mind that Montana law (Section 18-8-204, MCA) sets out minimum criteria that should be considered for selection of architects, engineers, or surveyors. The factors involved in reviewing responses to an RFP for management services may be different from those involved in an RFP for engineering services.

SIGNED: _____
(EVALUATOR)

DATE: